



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ized" war, it certainly should be a professedly Christian country like ours, especially when fighting, as is claimed, in the name of civilization. But what success has attended the experiment? It has all been a miserable failure. In spite of the loud claims made at Washington and among supporters of the war elsewhere that our forces in the Philippines have been extraordinarily humane, gentle and patient, it has all at once become clear as noonday that in sections of the islands American officers and soldiers, not expecting that their doings would come to light, have been guilty of barbarities scarcely above the bestialities of the lowest savages. Revenge and retaliation have rarely ever been carried to harsher extremes. The claim of the country to be waging a righteous and humane war has utterly and ingloriously broken down. The war has been wicked in its purpose and immeasurably wicked in its methods, and no amount of continuance of it can change its character one jot or tittle.

It has been overwhelmingly proved once more—needless as the proof was—that there is no such thing as a righteous and humane war, and that there never can be. The purpose of a war may sometimes be righteous and humane—alas, how infrequently!—but war in itself, wherever waged and for whatever end, is always, in its deeds and in the dispositions and passions which it produces, a ghastly mockery of righteousness and humanity. Its savage and vicious heart always manifests itself in one way or another. When will the moral sense of the world see this simple fact?

Further Progress of Arbitration.

No important movement develops exactly along the lines which are marked out for it. The arbitration movement has had its surprises as well as others. Six years ago we all thought that the United States and Great Britain were the nations ripest for an arbitration treaty, and most certain to have one first. The effort to secure one failed. Not even at The Hague did the two English-speaking nations have any precedence over France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, or the Netherlands, in the effort for a tribunal for the pacific settlement of disputes. Since the Hague Conference they have taken no further joint step in the direction of making the provisions of the Hague treaty certain to be used by them. There is at the present moment no sign that they will soon do this.

Meanwhile the movement has gone on along other lines. The nineteen American republics, as we have heretofore stated, have at Mexico City agreed upon a convention by which they adhere to the Hague treaty, and another by which they pledge themselves to submit to the Hague Court all that class of questions arising from the claims of citizens

of one country against another for damages and indemnities. Ten of them have signed by their delegates a treaty for the submission of all their disputes to the Hague Court. The United States and Denmark, in the treaty for the cession of the Danish West Indies to this country, have agreed, by an article in the convention, to submit to the Hague Court all questions arising as to the interpretation of the treaty. The German and the Netherlands governments have done the same in a treaty regarding the construction of submarine cables in the Pacific, in cases where these cable lines may affect the interests of their respective colonies.

The governments of the United States and Mexico have just come to an agreement to submit to the Hague Court the celebrated case of the "Pious Fund," which has been on hand in one way or another ever since the cession of California to the United States at the close of the Mexican War. (For an account of this controversy, see "International Arbitrations," by John Bassett Moore, Vol. II., page 1348.) No one would have guessed that this step,—a step of immense significance,—the submission of the *first case* to the Hague Court, would have been taken by the United States and Mexico, and that the case referred would have been of such a nature. But so it is, and the ultimate importance of it is just as great as if the two parties had been the United States and Germany, or Great Britain and Russia.

But we have just now an encouraging surprise in another direction. The Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs took advantage of the presence at Mexico City of representatives from all the Spanish-American States, and instructed the Spanish Minister in Mexico, the Marquis de Prat, to arrange with them for the conclusion of arbitration treaties between their respective States and Spain. The Marquis de Prat, in obedience to his instructions, has pushed the matter and already signed conventions with Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Salvador, San Domingo and Uruguay, and similar treaties will shortly be signed with Peru, Honduras, Costa Rica and Venezuela.

According to the terms of these *nine treaties* already signed, all differences which may arise between these countries and Spain are to be submitted to arbitration. The arbitrator, in the first instance, is to be either the Chief of a Spanish-American State or a tribunal composed of Spaniards or Spanish-Americans. In case of a failure to agree upon such an arbitrator, it is provided that controversies shall go to the Hague Court.

The form of these treaties may not be all that could be desired, as they do not adopt the Hague Court as the tribunal of first reference; but this Court is recognized in them, and it will not be difficult under them, if they shall be ratified, for the

governments having differences to go direct to the Hague Court. That certainly would ultimately be the course which would be followed. But the great thing is that such treaties have been drawn. If they go into effect, as is not at all improbable, they will bring Spain and all these Spanish countries into a bond of arbitration the international effect of which would be very powerful, not only among themselves, but throughout the world.

A World Legislature.

On the initiative of Mr. Raymond L. Bridgman, a prominent press correspondent, a resolution was recently brought before the Massachusetts General Assembly, asking that body to petition Congress to have the President invite foreign governments to send representatives to an international conference to provide for the creation of a permanent world legislature.

The committee of the Massachusetts Assembly to whom the subject was referred are understood to have taken considerable interest in the matter, but they reported against action this year, on the ground that the time is not ripe for such a movement.

In this judgment these Massachusetts legislators are partly right and partly wrong. The world is much farther advanced toward this goal than is generally supposed. Many developments of recent years clearly indicate that the day is not far off when some sort of an international legislative body of permanent character will be created, to deal with those general world-questions which are rapidly increasing in number and imperativeness, but with which the nations have now no adequate method of dealing.

As a matter of fact, the movement for a general permanent international parliament or congress is as old as that for a high court of nations, which we now have, though not yet taking in all the nations of the world. During the vigorous early days of the peace movement in the last century a Congress of Nations and a Court of Nations were always associated together in the minds of the very able peace leaders like Worcester, Ladd, Channing, Upham, Burritt, Walker, Sumner *et al.*, who grasped the subject in all its scope with extraordinary clearness and fulness. They felt that a Court and a Congress were the necessary complements of each other.

Even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in the plans put forward by William Penn and others for the peace of Europe, the idea of an international parliament or diet held a prominent place. It is not strange that this idea, which has not been much in evidence the past generation, should be revived at this time. The strange thing rather is that it should ever have fallen out of view.

The reasons for the creation of a permanent inter-

national legislature, to take the place of the temporary quasi-legislative congresses which have met from time to time for a hundred years, are just as strong and practically the same as those urged with so great force for the last ten years in behalf of a permanent tribunal to take the place of the *ad hoc* arbitration tribunals which have been set up in numerous instances for the settlement of disputes. If permanency is indispensable in the one case, it is equally so in the other.

The governments of the world, in the present state of civilization, cannot avoid a certain amount of joint legislation. This they have long recognized, and they have in recent years frequently organized temporary congresses and conferences, to deal with pressing questions affecting the interests of a number of them. Since the overthrow of Napoleon in 1815 about twenty important international congresses and conferences have been held, an average of one about every four and a half years. The work of many of these gatherings has been essentially legislative. In the case of some of them, nothing practical has resulted, because of the failure of the respective governments to ratify the conventions agreed upon. In that of others, permanent results of an important political or humanitarian character have been secured, and permanent contributions have been made to international law and policy.

It seems not at all improbable that in the near future these temporary efforts at international legislation will develop into something more orderly, general and permanent. They have done great service to mankind, in spite of their irregular and uncertain character, just as the temporary arbitration tribunals have done. They are an outgrowth of the constantly developing world-society, — the growing complexity of international relations, and the steadily advancing unification and coöperation of all peoples and nations. Their ultimate outcome cannot be anything less than a world legislature.

The entire idea of such a universal international parliament once seemed utterly Utopian. It seems so to many still. But the Utopia of to-day is certain to be the reality of to-morrow, as any one may easily convince himself who will take the trouble to examine carefully the trend of the swift and mighty world movements on whose currents we are being borne so irresistibly on.

Dr. Hale as a Practical Peacemaker.

The tribute paid to Edward Everett Hale on the 3d of April, the eightieth anniversary of his birth, when in Symphony Hall, Boston, such a company of men and women came together as it would be hard for the New England capital or any other city to duplicate, was of a kind which rarely comes to any man; but, curiously enough, in Senator Hoar's